6/11/70

Dear Paul,

While assembling a duplicate set of my Archives correspondence I handled the letters relating to my request that any rejected requests be forwarded as an appeal. Your interpretation is correct; there remains a haze because their letter was not exactly responsive.

First I asked in specific cases that if the specific request was rejected it be forwarded as an appeal. In each case they did not inform me their had or hadn't, would or wouldn't, but I did make specific, individual requests that I think do conform with any reasonable interpretation of the regulations. When I raised the question about this they said the correspondence was too voluminous, so I went over it and did write requests for some of the thing, under the impression that Woods would review each request personally and either honor them or forward as an appeal.

Although this was my request, this was not his response, so I'll have to do that to take no chances, unless we want to test this business of his not forwarding the appeals when they were made. However, despite their contrary letter, I did write them as he had sugrested about some of the items.

On another matter, Bud phoned today. I asked him to let me know when I could see the files you returned. He said he had gotten them before he got my letter, so they have been refiled. He also said you have a list of them and gave him a copy. When you have time, would you mark a copy of this list, please, with those you think more important? I will, in time, go over all of them, but I'd like a system of priorities because it will take time. I have too much to do. Bud gave me the impression he didn't think these are of special significance and that I knew about most of them. I'll be seeing him some time next week. Incidently, he confirms my reaction to the S-I story, the only one I've seen, that the adverse ruling in Tennessee State court last week is a kind of victory.

Sincerely,